

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

MARLON J. JONES	§
	§
Defendant Below-	§ No. 120, 2005
Appellant,	§
	§
v.	§ Court Below—Superior Court
	§ of the State of Delaware,
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§ in and for New Castle County
	§ Cr. ID 9801001203
Plaintiff Below-	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: September 13, 2005

Decided: September 19, 2005

Before **BERGER, JACOBS**, and **RIDGELY**, Justices.

**ORDER**

This 19<sup>th</sup> day of September 2005, upon consideration of the appellant's Supreme Court Rule 26(c) brief, his attorney's motion to withdraw, and the State's response thereto, it appears to the Court that:

(1) In March 2005, the Superior Court adjudicated the defendant-appellant, Marlon Jones, guilty of his third probation violation. Jones had admitted the violations charged by his probation officer. The Superior Court sentenced Jones to a total period of three years at Level V incarceration to be followed by decreasing levels of supervision. This is Jones' appeal.

(2) Jones' counsel on appeal has filed a brief and a motion to withdraw pursuant to Rule 26(c). Jones' counsel asserts that, based upon a

complete and careful examination of the record, there are no arguably appealable issues. By letter, Jones' attorney informed him of the provisions of Rule 26(c) and provided Jones with a copy of the motion to withdraw and the accompanying brief. Jones also was informed of his right to supplement his attorney's presentation. Jones has not raised any issues for this Court's consideration. The State has responded to the position taken by Jones' counsel and has moved to affirm the Superior Court's judgment.

(3) The standard and scope of review applicable to the consideration of a motion to withdraw and an accompanying brief under Rule 26(c) is twofold: (a) this Court must be satisfied that defense counsel has made a conscientious examination of the record and the law for arguable claims; and (b) this Court must conduct its own review of the record and determine whether the appeal is so totally devoid of at least arguably appealable issues that it can be decided without an adversary presentation.\*

(4) This Court has reviewed the record carefully and has concluded that Jones' appeal is wholly without merit and devoid of any arguably appealable issue. We also are satisfied that Jones' counsel has made a

---

\* *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 83 (1988); *McCoy v. Court of Appeals of Wisconsin*, 486 U.S. 429, 442 (1988); *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967).

conscientious effort to examine the record and the law and has properly determined that Jones could not raise a meritorious claim in this appeal.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the State's motion to affirm is GRANTED. The judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED. The motion to withdraw is moot.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Jack B. Jacobs  
Justice